

REMARKS**INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 2, 10, 17, 18, and 21-24 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24 are pending and under consideration.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action at page 2, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under 35 USC § 101 for failure to satisfy a requirement that the claim(s) be directed to "technological arts". In the precedential decision of *Ex Parte Lundgren*, Appeal 2003-2088 (October 2005), the USPTO Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences has ruled "that there is currently no judicially recognized 'technological arts' test to determine patent eligible subject matter under § 101." The Board also specifically indicated that the non-precedential decision of *Ex Parte Bowman* was not a binding decision. For this reason, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn for lack of a foundation in the law.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action at page 3, claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,601,044 to Wallman in view of John M. Dalton, "How the Stock Market Works," NYIF Corp. 1993, 99-107-111. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a computer-implemented method for supporting a trading of an odd lot that is less than a round lot stock number determined in every stock company. The method of independent claim 1 includes "receiving from a customer an odd lot selling order or an odd lot buying order for a particular stock company", "judging whether or not a number of total stocks of said odd lot selling orders or a number of total stocks of said odd lot buying orders received at said receiving is over a threshold value that is less than said round lot stock number and is determined by a predetermined rule", and "if it is judged at said judging that the number of total stocks of said odd lot selling orders or the number of total stocks of said odd lot buying orders is over said threshold, outputting a selling order of said round lot stock number defined for said particular stock company for said odd lot selling orders or a buying order of said round lot stock number defined for said particular stock company for said odd lot buying orders." Independent claims 9 and 17 recite similar features.

Both Wallman and Dalton teach the aggregation of odd lot orders in order to obtain a round lot order. See Wallman at col. 11, lines 53-63 and Dalton at page 109, lines 3-7. Dalton also teaches various types of odd lot orders including odd-lot limit orders to buy, limit orders to sell long, limit orders to sell short, odd-lot stop short orders, stop limit orders, on-the-quotation orders, and at-the-close orders. Additionally, Dalton discusses differentials.

At page 4 of the outstanding Office Action, Wallman is relied upon to teach only "A method, storage medium and a system for supporting a trading of an odd lot that is less than a round lot stock number determined in every stock company, said method comprising the steps of: receiving from a customer, an odd lot selling order or an odd lot buying order for a particular stock company." Wallman at col. 52, lines 22-25, is cited in support of this assertion. Page 4 of the outstanding Office Action acknowledges that Wallman fails to teach or suggest any of the other features of independent claims 1, 9, or 17.

At page 5 of the outstanding Office Action, it is asserted that Dalton teaches that there are two basic types of trade according to size – round lots and odd lots. Further, Dalton is relied upon to teach that odd-lot orders may be bunched as long as the consent of each customer is obtained. The Office Action asserts that "one of ordinary skill in the art making such a judgment would have been obvious to do when viewing the system of Wallman, thus providing a better control of a particular buy/sell order." Applicants respectfully disagree.

Wallman fails to teach or suggest the use of any threshold value in making a judgment regarding odd lot trading. Thus, Wallman fails to teach or suggest "judging whether or not a number of total stocks of said odd lot selling orders or a number of total stocks of said odd lot buying orders received at said receiving is over a threshold value that is less than said round lot stock number and is determined by a predetermined rule." This is acknowledged at page 4 of the outstanding Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that Dalton, which is relied upon to cure the deficiencies of Wallman, also fails to teach or suggest "judging whether or not a number of total stocks of said odd lot selling orders or a number of total stocks of said odd lot buying orders received at said receiving is over a threshold value that is less than said round lot stock number and is determined by a predetermined rule," as Dalton does not teach or suggest any threshold value.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Wallman and Dalton, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach all of the features of claims 1, 9, and 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, and 17, and those claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom, patentably distinguish over the prior art and are in condition for allowance.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 18, 19, and 20 were rejected at pages 6-7 of the outstanding Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 18, 19, and 20 patentably distinguish over Wallman and Dalton for at least those reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

With respect to claims 2, 10, and 18, Applicants note that the Office Action asserts that Dalton teaches the determination of "appropriate" fees. The threshold value in these claims, however, does not refer to any trading fee. Instead, as described in independent claims 1, 9, and 17, the threshold value refers to a number of stocks. Neither Wallman nor Dalton teaches or suggests this feature. For at least this reason, and those set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 10, and 18 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 5, 13, and 21 were rejected at pages 8-9 of the outstanding Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5, 13, and 21 patentably distinguish over Wallman and Dalton for at least those reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

Additionally, Applicants note that the Office Action asserts that "one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to such a rule for determining a minimum number of ordered stocks in the system of Wallman in order to maintain the system of Wallman and also to provide the ordered stocks to customers/investors." Applicants respectfully disagree, as neither Wallman nor Dalton teaches or suggests "providing a minimum number of ordered stocks" or "providing a number of remainder stocks" as recited in claims 5, 13, 21. For at least these reasons and those set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Wallman and Dalton, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of claims 5, 13, and 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5, 13, and 21 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 6, 14, and 22 were rejected at pages 9-11 of the outstanding Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6, 14, and 22 patentably distinguish over Wallman and Dalton for at least those reasons as those claims from which they depend.

Further, Applicants note that neither Wallman nor Dalton teaches or suggests "providing one stock" or "providing a number of remainder stocks," as recited in claims 6, 14, and 22. For at least these reasons and those set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Wallman and Dalton, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of claims 6, 14, and 22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6, 14, and 22 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 7, 15, and 23 were rejected at pages 11-13 of the outstanding Office Action. At pages 11-12 of the outstanding Office Action, it is acknowledged that Wallman fails to teach the features of claims 7, 15, and 23. The Office Action asserts, however, that "in the purchasing/selling of financial securities, there could be a great number of possible ways to set a predetermined rule for providing a minimum number of ordered stocks to each customer." Applicants respectfully assert, however, that neither Wallman nor Dalton teaches or suggests "providing a minimum number of ordered stocks" or "providing a number of remainder stocks," as recited in claims 7, 15, and 23. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Wallman and Dalton, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of claims 7, 15, and 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7, 15, and 23 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 8, 16, and 24 were rejected at pages 13-14 of the outstanding Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8, 16, and 24 patentably distinguish over Wallman and Dalton for at least those reasons as those claims from which they depend.

Further, at page 13 of the outstanding Office Action, it is acknowledged that Wallman fails to teach the features of claims 8, 16, and 24. Dalton is not discussed in the rejection of claims 8, 16, and 24. Applicants note that neither Wallman nor Dalton teaches or suggests "providing one stock" or "providing a number of remainder stocks," as recited in claims 8, 16, and 24. For at least these reasons and those set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Wallman and Dalton, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of claims 8, 16, and 24. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8, 16, and 24 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 28 November 2005

By: [Signature]
Allison Olenginski
Registration No. 55509

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 11/28, 2005

STAAS & HALSEY

By: [Signature]

Date: 11/28/05